



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 8**

1595 Wynkoop Street
DENVER, CO 80202-1129
Phone 800-227-8917
<http://www.epa.gov/region08>

April 8, 2008

Ref: 8EPR-N

Minuteman Missile National Historic Site
Attn: Superintendent Mark Herberger
21280 SD Highway 240
Philip, SD 57567

RE: Minuteman Missile National Historic Site
Draft General Management Plan/
Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)
CEQ# 20080068

Dear Mr. Herberger:

EPA has reviewed the National Park Service's (NPS) DEIS associated with the NPS's Minuteman Missile National Historic Site established in 1999. Our comments are provided in accordance with our authorities under section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4332(C), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7609.

This Site contains the best-preserved example of the Minuteman II defense system in the nation. Under Preferred Alternative 4, the DEIS proposes to: 1) restore the Delta One launch control facility to its ready-alert status; 2) rehabilitate the Delta Nine launch facility containing the deactivated Minuteman II Missile and its silo and underground utility support building to its stand-down appearance; and 3) construct a 7,700 square foot visitor/administrative facility and shuttle system north of Exit 131 along U.S. Interstate 90 in South Dakota. This newly-built facility would be located near the existing Delta One (Exit 127) and Delta Nine (Exit 116) facilities.

As a result of our review, we agree with the NPS's conclusion that Alternative 4 is also the Environmentally Preferred Alternative, as it best meets the six criteria defined in Section 101 under NEPA. EPA does have one potential concern related to wetland resources. In the Section of the DEIS titled "Impact Topics Considered but Not Analyzed in Detail" (DEIS p.27), it states: "The National Grasslands property located on the south side of exit 127 contains a wetland. However, if this location was selected, impacts on the wetland would be avoided or minimized through design of the visitor/administrative facility. Therefore wetlands were dismissed as an impact topic." Based on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's National Wetlands Inventory web-based maps, it appears that emergent wetlands do occur locally in this area and therefore could be impacted by the construction of this facility as proposed under Alternative 2. In the event that Alternative 2 is chosen, these impacts should be fully disclosed and the appropriate site-specific

mitigation measures identified in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), consistent with NEPA requirements.

EPA has rated the NPS's DEIS Preferred Alternative LO (Lack of Objection). "LO" indicates that EPA's review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. However, the selection of Alternative 2 would be cause for concern and potential impacts to wetland resources would need to be fully disclosed and mitigated as noted above. A copy of EPA's rating criteria is enclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please contact me at (303) 312-6004 or Douglas Minter of my staff at (303) 312-6079.

Sincerely,

/s/ Larry Svoboda
Director, NEPA Program
Office of Ecosystems Protection and Remediation

Enclosure

